

REMARKS

This paper is responsive to the Office Communication mailed August 11, 2009 that contended the claim amendments filed July 23, 2009 were non-responsive and requested clarification. The undersigned thanks the Examiner for the telephone interview on August 18, 2009 to discuss the Office Communication. As explained more fully below, Applicants understood from the interview that the Examiner would agree to withdraw the non-responsive holding after receiving a written submission that summarized the statements provided to the Examiner during the interview.

Applicants submit the following “Statement of the Substance of the Interview” per the requirement set forth in the Interview Summary, mailed August 26, 2009 that includes a summary of the statements presented to the Examiner during the interview. Applicants request withdrawal of the non-responsive contention after consideration of the following.

I. **Statement of the Substance of the Interview**

During the telephone interview of August 18, 2009, the undersigned identified original claim 27 as providing an example of support for the embodiment sought through the claim amendments filed July 23, 2009 and the disclosure beginning at page 17, line 31 and ending at page 18, line 2 of the original specification, for example, as providing support for the new claims. Applicants note now that these are examples of support as other portions of the specification, drawings, and originally filed claims may also provide support for the claim amendments filed July 23, 2009.

Furthermore, original claims in addition to claim 27 may provide support for the embodiment sought through the claim amendments filed July 23, 2009.

The Examiner also indicated during the telephone interview a need for a drawing explicitly disposing an embodiment in a multiple projection system, such as the multiple projection system including prior art components shown in Figure 1. The Interview Summary, mailed August 26, 2009, stated that the new drawing would show “a key element to the invention.” Applicants clarify respectfully that it is the Examiner’s position that the invention includes a “key element” and Applicants decline to characterize any particular element of one or more claims as “key.”

Nevertheless, in response to the statement by the Examiner regarding a new Figure, Applicants submit new Figure 29 with this paper that illustrates the embodiment shown in Figure 7 disposed in the multiple projection system of Figure 1 by replacing certain prior art components shown in Figure 1 with the embodiment from Figure 7. An example of support for new Figure 29 can be found in the specification at page 17, line 31 through page 18, line 2. A paragraph for inclusion in the “Brief Description of the Drawings” section is submitted with this paper that briefly describes new Figure 29.

Applicants also note that the embodiments depicted in Figure 9, Figure 10, and Figure 24 can each be disposed similarly in a multiple projection system consistent with the description accompanying each of those Figures.

Applicants believe that all outstanding issues are satisfied and request that the response, including claim amendments, filed July 23, 2009 be entered into the record, that the new Figure and specification amendments presented with this paper be entered into the record, and that a Notice of Allowance promptly issue.

No fee is believed due for this submission. If any fees are due, such fees may be charged to Deposit Account number 11-0855. The Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned attorney at 404-745-2520 to address any outstanding matters.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jason D. Gardner 58180/
Jason D. Gardner
Reg. No. 58180

DATE: September 4, 2009

KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP
1100 Peachtree Street
Suite 2800
Atlanta, Georgia, 30309-4530
404 745-2520 (direct)
404 541 4619 (direct fax)